92-113

No.

Supreme Court, U.S.
FILED
JUN 12 1992
OFFICE OF THE CLERK

In The

Supreme Court of the United States

October Term, 1991

MARIA GRACIELA RAMIREZ,

Petitioner,

vs.

THE STATE OF TEXAS,

Respondent.

Petition for Writ of Certiorari to the Supreme Court of Texas

PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI RULE 13.1-.4

MARIA GRACIELA RAMIREZ
Petitioner, Pro Se
1517 Garcia Street
Laredo, Texas 78040
(512) 723-6925

2086
Lutz Appellate Printers, inc. • NJ (908) 257-6850 • (800) 3 APPEAL • NY (212) 840-4640 • MA (617) 542-1114
DC (202) 783-7288 • PA (215) 925-6500 • USA (800) 5 APPEAL

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

I. Does the State of Texas, by its courts, have the power to deny to a woman pro se before the courts, the right to due process of law, and equal protection of the law, in violation of the 14th Amendment Rights.

II. Does the State of Texas, by its judges, officials, and officers, have the power to encroach upon the rights of a citizen because of sex identity, in violation of the national doctrines of "liberties and freedoms equal for all".

III. Does the State of Texas, by its officials and officers, have the power to terrorize and torture a woman citizen into signing false confessions — and the power to enter into the home of a lone woman to torture and rob, without any kind of warrants, in violation of the 4th and 8th Amendments to the United States Constitution.

IV. Does the State of Texas, by its judges and officials, have the power to publicly stigmatize a woman before the court as of mental illness, so as to silence her voice for her rights, in violation of the 8th Amendment Rights.

V. Does the State of Texas, by its judges and officials, have the power to deny to a woman citizen the right to a jury hearing, and deny the right to an impartial jury, when imposed with a jury totally selected by the prosecution, in violation of the 6th and 7th Amendment Rights.

VI. Does the State of Texas, by its judges, officials, and officers, have the power to plot the assassination of a woman citizen, so as to silence her voice for her rights, in violation of Civil and Human Rights of a Democratic nation.

VII. Does the State of Texas, by its judges and officials, have the power to defraud a woman of her property by force, aggression, intimidations, and oppression of rights, in violation of the 5th and 14th Amendments to the United States Constitution.

VIII. Does the State of Texas, by its judges, officials, and officers, have the power to segregate the women of Texas from their guaranted constitutional and civil rights, in violation of the Democratic doctrines of liberties and freedoms equal for all races, religions, and sex identities.

ORAL ARGUMENT BEFORE THE COURT

Petitioner, Maria Graciela Ramirez, as Pro se, approaches the High Court, for permission to move before the Court in oral argument on the severe oppression of rights upon the women of the nation imposed by state and federal judges and officials — and such argument based on the factual evidence of the severe abuse of rights upon Petitioner by state and federal judges and officials along more than thirteen years.

It is that in the history of the United States of America within its doctrines of Liberties and Freedoms Equal For All — the women of the nation have only ONE constitutional right, and it is up to the decision of the judges if a woman be extended any kind of civil rights, or constitutional rights.

It is thus, that Liberties and Freedoms are not equal for all when the judiciary leads the way in the severe oppression of rights upon a woman before the courts.

It is that the State of Texas, not only has denied the very basics of a fair hearing to a woman, but has moved to assassinate such woman so as to silence her voice for her rights.

It is that for more than eight years, the chief judge for the federal courts of the Southern District of Texas, has held Petitioner as his hostage without rights.

Petitioner pleads to the high court for oral argument.

Maria Graciela Ramirez
MARIA GRACIELA RAMIREZ
Petitioner Pro Se

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

Questions Presented i

Oral Argument Before The Court iii

Table of Contents iv

Table of Authorities iv

Opinions Below 2

Jurisdiction 2

Constitutional & Statutory Provisions Involved 2

Statement of the Case 3

Reasons for Granting the Writ 5

Conclusion 5

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Case Cited:

First Impression Case
(Oppression Rights on Sex Identity)

Statutes Cited:

USC Title 18, Section 241 2

Contents

Page

USC Title 18, Section 242 2

USC Title 28, Section 1654 3

USC Title 42, Section 1985 2

USC Title 42, Section 1986 2

United States Constitution Cited:

U.S. Const. amend. II 2

U.S. Const. amend. IV ..... i, 2

U.S. Const. amend. V ..... ii, 2

U.S. Const. amend. VI ..... i, 2

U.S. Const. amend. VII ..... i, 2

U.S. Const. amend. VIII ..... i, 2

U.S. Const. amend. XIV ..... i, ii, 1, 2, 5

U.S. Const. Article VI(2) 1, 6

Other:

U.S. Supreme Court — *Miranda v. Arizona* 5a

Contents

Page

APPENDIX

Appendix I

Section A — Texas Supreme Court — Dismissed ... 1a

Section B — Texas Supreme Court Rehearing 2a

Appendix II

Section A — Statutes 3a

Section B — United States Constitution 3a

Others — U.S. Supreme Court, *Miranda v. Arizona* 5a

Appendix III

Section A — Texas Appeal Court, 4th District 6a

Section B — Texas District Courts:

Sec. B-1 — 111th Webb County 8a

Sec. B-2 — 49th Webb County #8548 ..... 13a

Sec. B-3 — 49th Webb County #20,730 ..... 15a

Sec. B-4 — 49th Webb County #38,011 ..... 18a

Contents

Section C — Related:

Sec. C-1 — Jury 21a

Sec. C-2 — Court Transcripts 22a

No.

In The

Supreme Court of the United States

October Term, 1991

MARIA GRACIELA RAMIREZ,

Petitioner,

vs.

THE STATE OF TEXAS,

Respondent.

Petition for a Writ of Certiorari to the Supreme Court of Texas

PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI
Rule 13.1-.4

Petitioner, Maria Graciela Ramirez, Pro Se, prays that a Writ of Certiorari be issued to review the judgment of the Supreme Court of Texas, who has moved to suppress and conceal the overwhelming evidence of the severe abuse of rights upon a woman by the Texas courts — and thus, the State of Texas, in violation and in defiance to Article VI(2) and the Fourteenth Amendment of the United States Constitution — when the courts of Texas

practice oppression of rights because of sex identity.[1]

OPINIONS BELOW

The opinion of the Supreme Court of Texas, identified as *Maria Graciela Ramirez, Petitioner vs. The State of Texas, Respondent,* in Case No. 2098 — was dismissed March 4, 1992, "for want of jurisdiction", when the jurisdiction was correct as Petitioner approached the court of last resort under extraordinary circumstances with pending assassination threats.

On March 25, 1992, the Supreme Court of Texas denied to Petitioner the rehearing petition before the Court.[2]

It is thus, that in the opinion of the Supreme Court of Texas, the Texas lower courts have the power to defraud a woman of her liberty and freedom rights — and the State of Texas, by its Supreme Court and Attorney General approve the oppression of rights because of sex identity.

JURISDICTION

The jurisdiction of this Court is invoked pursuant to 28 U.S.C., Section 1257(3) and to Local Court Rule 13.1-.4

CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVED

Amendments II, IV, V, VI, VII, VIII, XIV to the United States Constitution.

Statutes Title 18, Section 241-242, Title 42, Section 1985-1986,

---

1. *See* Appendix II, Sec. B, p. 4a-5a

2. *See* Appendix I, Sec. A-B p. 1a-2a.

Title 28, Section 1654.[3]

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

The Supreme Court of Texas had jurisdiction pursuant to Texas RAP No. 140, Section 10, Direct Appeal in extraordinary circumstances — and under Article 5, Section 3-b Texas Constitution — when the Texas District Courts, and Texas Appeal Court 4th District moved to totally deny the very basics of a fair hearing to Petitioner.

I. The severe violations of rights upon Petitioner were initiated in February 1979, when the Texas 111th District Court for Webb County, Texas, in Cause No. 31,320, moved to defraud Petitioner of all her rights, using intimidations, cruel punishments, denial of due process and equal protection of the law, and rendered a final judgment based on one-sided hearings.

II. The oppression of rights upon Petitioner continued in September 1985, when the 49th District Court for Webb County, Texas, in Cause No. 8548, moved to gag Petitioner of her rights, and again rendered a judgment on a one-sided hearing, using intimidations to suppress due process.

III. The oppression of rights upon Petitioner continued in February 1987 at the 49th District Court for Webb County, Texas, in Cause No. 20,730, when Petitioner, after being terrorized and tortured for 24 hours (Dec. 2-3-86) into signing false confessions, was processed at the 49th District Court, in the most severe and savage abuse of rights, that included threats, intimidations, defamation stigmas, forced to be a witness against herself, declared guilty by a jury totally selected by the prosecution.

---

3. *See* Appendix II Sec. A-B p. 3a.

IV. The oppression of rights upon Petitioner continued in February 1987 at the 49th District Court for Webb County, Texas with the filing of the double jeoprady Cause No. 38,011, that totally denied to Petitioner due process of law and equal protection of the law, and moved completely under perjury testimonies, imposing upon Petitioner with threats, extortion, and embezzlment.

V. The oppression of rights upon Petitioner continued in September 1988, at the Texas Court of Appeals 4th District in Appeal No. 04-88-00461-CV, where Petitioner was immediately relegated as inferior for a woman approaching the court as pro se without a lawyer, and the Chief Judge and other judges ignoring the content of the complaint, though such was written in the national language of English.

VI. The oppression of rights upon Petitioner continued as Petitioner approached the Texas Supreme Court several times — but all the Justices, with pre-judge decisions decided that an Hispanic woman as pro se should have no right to a fair hearing.

VII. The oppression of rights upon Petitioner continued when Petitioner approached the United States District Courts for the Southern District of Texas in January 1984 as Claimant in the Bankruptcy Court — and then as Plaintiff in Civil Actions, and all complaints of violations of rights were dismissed without a fair hearing — and all transfered petitions denied, with Chief Judge James DeAnda holding Petitioner as hostage of such federal courts for more than eight (8) years, and still going on.

VIII. The oppression of rights upon Petitioner continued when the United States Court of Appeals, Fifth Circuit and the United States Supreme Court, moved to deny to Petitioner any and all kind of a fair or impartial hearing — and the signature of a woman as pro se with a complaint before the courts equate to pleading for a fair hearing before the locked doors of every level of courts in the nation.

REASONS FOR GRANTING THE WRIT

The Writ of Certiorari should be granted for three important reasons of national interest to a true nation of liberties and freedoms (1) that holds the women of the nation in bondage without rights by state and federal courts, and the women relegated as inferiors to have to beg and plead for even the very basics to an impartial hearing (2) that while the Congress of the United States of America refuses to extend to women the equal constitutional and civil rights — then the Supreme Court of the United States should move to investigate the severe abuse of rights upon women by the courts of the nation, and move to present the *Maria Case* as a First Impression Case that should become a landmark for equality to the security (Constitutional) and Protective (Civil Rights) for all the women of the nation (3) to expose the State of Texas, and other states who move with severe abuse of rights because of sex identity.

For the reasons thus mentioned in this brief — for the thirteen years of Petitioner desperately pleading for a fair hearing within state and federal courts — and for the savage decision of the State of Texas that Petitioner as a women, shall be assassinated so as to silence her voice for her rights, and thus set as an example to other women who should try to defend their rights as pro se — then the writ of certiorari should be issued swiftly.

CONCLUSION

It is that the Fourteenth Amendment, Section 1, to the United States Constitution, was precisely established to deter the States from encroaching on the rights of the people, and when the State of Texas, by its courts and officials, openly segregates women from their rights, then the State of Texas remains in defiance and confrontation to the 14th Amendment rights.

It is that Article VI, Section 2, declares that this Constitution and the laws of the United States which shall be made under the authority of the United States, shall be the supreme Law of the Land; and the Judges in every State shall be bound thereby — and the judges in the State of Texas have moved in direct defiance to the Constitution and the laws of the United States in moving with oppression of rights because of sex identity.

Dated: June 2, 1992

Respectfully submitted,

MARIA GRACIELA RAMIREZ
Petitioner Pro Se

APPENDIX

APPENDIX I — SECTION A

THE SUPREME COURT OF TEXAS
P.O. Box 12248
Supreme Court Building
Austin, Texas 78711
John T. Adams, Clerk

March 4, 1992

Ms. Maria Graciela Ramirez
1517 Garcia Street
Laredo, TX 78040

Mr. Gary L. Bledsoe
Office of the Attorney General of Texas
Dan Morales, A.G.
P.O. Box 12548 Capitol Station
Austin, TX 78711

RE: Case No. D-2098

Style: MARIA GRACIELA RAMIREZ
vs. THE STATE OF TEXAS

Dear Counsel:

Today, the Supreme Court of Texas dismissed the above referenced direct appeal for want of jurisdiction.

Sincerely,

JOHN T. ADAMS, Clerk

s/ Courtland Crocker
COURTLAND CROCKER,
Deputy

APPENDIX I — SECTION B

THE SUPREME COURT OF TEXAS
P.O. Box 12248
Supreme Court Building
Austin, Texas 78711
John T. Adams, Clerk

March 25, 1992

Ms. Maria Graciela Ramirez
1517 Garcia Street
Laredo, TX 78040

Mr. Gary L. Bledsoe
Office of the Attorney General of Texas
Dan Morales, A.G.
P.O. Box 12548 Capitol Station
Austin, TX 78711

RE: Case No. D-2098

Style: MARIA GRACIELA RAMIREZ v. THE STATE OF TEXAS

Dear Counsel:

Today, the Supreme Court of Texas overruled the motion for rehearing of the direct appeal in the above styled case.

Sincerely,

JOHN T. ADAMS, Clerk

s/ Courtland Crocker
COURTLAND CROCKER,
Deputy

APPENDIX II

Section A — Statutes

USC Title 18, Section 241 — Civil Rights — Conspiracy against rights of citizens — Judges, officials, and officers, moved in conspiracy against the rights of Petitioner.

USC Title 18, Sec. 242 — Civil Rights — Deprivation of rights under color of law — Judges, officials, and officers, under color of law, moved to deprive Petitioner of constitutional, civil, and human rights.

USC Title 42, Sec. 1985 — Civil Rights — Depriving persons of rights or privileges — Judges, officials, and officers, moved to deprive Petitioner of rights and privileges, directly and indirectly, and moved to deny equal protection of the law to Petitioner.

USC Title 42, Sec. 1986 — Civil Rights — Action for neglect to Prevent — Judges, officials, and officers were in knowledge of the violations upon Petitioner.

USC Title 28 Sec. 1654 — Appearance personally or by counsel — Judges refused to accept Petitioner as pro se before the courts, by defrauding Petitioner of constitutional and civil rights.

Section B - United States Constitution

U.S. Const. Amend. II — The right of the people to keep and bear Arms, shall not be infringed — Texas has denied to Petitioner the right to bear Arms (for protection) inside her ranch and home.

U.S. Const. Amend. IV — The right of the people to be

secure in their persons, houses, papers, and effects against unreasonable searches and seizures — Warrants shall issue, but upon probable cause — Officers, entered the house of Petitioner, tortured her, and seized property without any warrants.

U.S. Const. Amend. V — Nor shall any person be subject for the same offence to be twice put in jeopardy — nor shall be compelled in any criminal case to be a witness against himself, nor be deprived of life, liberty, or property without due process of law — Petitioner was forced to approach the court in a double jeopardy case, was forced to be a witness against herself, and was deprived of liberty rights and property, imposed with attempt assassination, without due process of law.

U.S. Const. Amend. VI — In all criminal prosecutions, the accused shall enjoy the right to a speedy and public trial, by an impartial jury — Petitioner was falsely accused as a criminal, had a long trial of intimidations and denial of rights, and was denied an impartial jury composed of jurors totally selected by the prosecution.

U.S. Const. Amend. VII — The right of trial by jury shall be preserved — Petitioner was denied a trial by an impartial jury.

U.S. Const. Amend. VIII — For excessive fines imposed, nor cruel and unusual punishments inflicted — Petitioner was imposed with excessive fines, and imposed with cruel and savage punishments of terrorist nations procedures.

U.S. Const. Amend. XIV — No State shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States — nor shall any State deprive any person of life, liberty, or property without due process of law; nor deny any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws — The State of Texas, by its courts, enforced that a woman can

be tortured into signing false confessions, can be denied all privileges to defend her life and her property, can be assassinated to silence her voice for her rights, the State of Texas deprived petitioner of her property by extortion, embezzlment, and oppression of rights, and the State of Texas, by its courts, totally denied due process of law and equal protection of the law, forcing Petitioner to remain where the press had publicly and viciously accused and condemned Petitioner.

U.S. Const. Article VI(2) — This Constitution and the Laws of the United States which shall be made, under the Authority of the United States, shall be the Supreme Law of the Land; and the Judges in every State shall be bound thereby — The judges of Texas moved in defiance to the Constitution and Laws of the United States by denying to a woman the Supreme Law of the Land because of sex identity.

Section C — Others

The U.S. Supreme Court, 1966 Term — *Miranda v. Arizona* — Prior to any custodial interrogation, the person must be warned: (1) That he has a right to remain silent; (2) That any statement he does make may be used as evidence against him; (3) That he has a right to the presence of an attorney — Petitioner was mentally tortured for 24 hours, with intimidations of bodily harm, until forced to sign the false confessions, without any Miranda rights of any kind — all the way Iran-Iraq terrorist procedures imposed upon Petitioner, with the conspiracy and consent of Texas judges, officials, and officers.

APPENDIX III — SECTION A

[Notation by Petitioner; Court of Appeals 4th District of Texas at San Antonio, Texas in Appeal No. 04-88-00461-CV, Presiding Judges Carlos C. Cadena, Shirley W. Butts, Alfonso Chapa, moved from August 1988 to February 1989 — the appeal arising from the double-jeopardy district court case of Case No. 38,011 — the appeal court immediately relegated Appellant (Petitioner) to the submission of Appellee because Appellant (Petitioner) as an Hispanic woman was approaching the court without a lawyer as pro se — the distorted court transcripts of Case No. 20,730 were sent to the Appeal Court by the Webb County (Texas) District Clerk — the Appeal Court judges moved to deny due process of law and equal protection of the law because of sex identity — such appeal was timely filed and with a response written in the national language of English.]

Court of Appeals
Fourth Supreme Judicial District of Texas
San Antonio

OPINION

Appeal No. 04-88-00461-CV

MARIA GRACIELA RAMIREZ,

Appellant

v.

GENARO DELEZA,

Appellee

Appeal from the 49th District Court of Webb County
Trial Court No. 38,011
Honorable Richard J. Woods, Judge Presiding

PER CURIAM OPINION

Sitting:

Carlos C. Cadena, Chief Justice
Shirley W. Butts, Justice
Alfonso Chapa, Justice

Delivered and Filed: February 8, 1989

DISMISSED FOR WANT OF PROSECUTION

This appeal is dismissed for want of prosecution.

Appellant failed to file her brief by the due date, October 13, 1988. On November 4, 1988, appellant was ordered to show cause before November 18, 1988, why her appeal should not be dismissed for failure to timely file her brief. She failed to respond.

On November 21, 1988, the court again ordered appellant to show cause why the appeal should not be dismissed. This order required that a motion for extension of time to file the brief had to be filed no later than January 16, 1989.

In response to the November 21, 1988, order, appellant filed a document entitled, "Appellant Now Devoid of Rights by State of Texas." She has not asked for an extension of time or made any effort to show cause why her appeal should not be dismissed. *See* TEX. R. APP. P. 74.

The appeal is dismissed for want of prosecution.

PER CURIAM

DO NOT PUBLISH.

APPENDIX III — SECTION B-1

[Notation by Petitioner; 111th District Court for Webb County, Texas, in Case No. 31,320, presiding Judge Antonio Zardenetta, moved from February 1979 to December 1981 — moving all the way in violations of due process of law and of equal protection of the law, moving with intimidations, cruel punishments, conspiracies to defraud Defendant (Petitioner) of property by force, aggression, denial of rights, intimidations of bodily harm, court transcripts destroyed to conceal violations.]

NO. 31,320

IN THE 111TH JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT
IN AND FOR WEBB COUNTY, TEXAS

GOOD HOPE REFINERIES, INC., AND ENSERCH EXPLORATION, INC.

VS.

MARIA GRACIELA RAMIREZ AND MARIA IRENE RAMIREZ

FINAL JUDGMENT

On this the 26th day of February, 1981, came on to be heard the above styled and numbered cause, same having been duly set on the Court's Docket, wherein GOOD HOPE REFINERIES, INC ., and ENSERCH EXPLORATION, INC., are Plaintiffs and MARIA GRACIELA RAMIREZ and MARIA IRENE RAMIREZ are Defendants, and the Plaintiffs appeared by and through their representative and by their attorney of record, and the Defendant, MARIA IRENE RAMIREZ appeared by and through her attorney of record, and the Defendant, MARIA

GRACIELA RAMIREZ, although duly notified of such setting, wholly failed to appear herein, and the attorney for the Plaintiffs and the attorney for the Defendant, MARIA IRENE RAMIREZ announcing to the Court that a compromise and settlement had been entered into between Plaintiffs and said Defendant, MARIA IRENE RAMIREZ and that the Defendant MARIA IRENE RAMIREZ desired to dismiss her cross-action heretofore filed against Plaintiffs, and the Court having heard the evidence and the arguments of counsel, finds as follows:

1. Plaintiffs and Defendant, MARIA IRENE RAMIREZ have entered into a compromise and settlement agreement and the cause of action by MARIA IRENE RAMIREZ against GOOD HOPE REFINERIES, INC., and ENSERCH EXPLORATION, INC., by way of her cross-action is hereby dismissed with prejudice.

2. As to the Defendant, MARIA GRACIELA RAMIREZ, Plaintiffs are entitled to final judgment for permanent injunction, as herein granted.

IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED, ADJUDGED and DECREED that a permanent injunction issue against the Defendant MARIA GRACIELA RAMIREZ, restraining and enjoining her from placing herself, articles or personal property, or locks, in such a place or manner as to interfere with the Plaintiffs' operations of the gas well situated on Defendant's land, as well as Plaintiffs' rights of ingress and egress to and from said well, or from interfering in any way with Plaintiffs' rights under those certain oil and gas leases namely, that certain oil and gas lease dated October 10, 1973 by and between MARIA GRACIELA RAMIREZ, a feme sole, as Lessor and James A. Mayo as Lessee and covering 517.02 acres of land, more or less, consisting of 255.90 acres out of Survey No. 2089, Abstract No. 589, Original Grantee, G.C. & S.F.Ry. Co., and 261.12 acres out of Survey

No. 2091, Abstract No. 588, Original Grantee, G.C. & S.F.Ry. Co.; said 517.02 acre tract being designated as Share No. 3 in that certain Deed of Partition executed by Candelario Hector Ramirez, and others, under date of June 22, 1966, recorded in Vol 351, pages 113-125, Deed Records of Webb County, Texas, reference being made to said Deed of Partition for a metes and bounds description of such 517.02 acre tract, which oil and gas lease is recorded in Vol 445, pages 110-114 of the Deed Records of Webb County, Texas; and that certain oil, gas and mineral lease dated October 10, 1973 by and between MARIA IRENE RAMIREZ, a feme sole, as Lessor and James A. Mayo as Lessee, insofar as same covers the westerly 186.98 acres more or less, out of that certain 487.02 acres, more or less, consisting of 70.0 acres out of Survey No. 2089, Abstract No. 589, Original Grantee, G.C. & S.F.Ry. Co., 73.07 acres out of Survey No. 2091, Abstract No. 588, Original Grantee G.C. & S.F.Ry. Co., 149.23 acres out of Survey No. 2085, Abstract No. 1366, Original Grantee G.C. & S.F.Ry.Co., 160.51 acres out of Survey No. 2087, Abstract No. 1267, Original Grantee, G.C. & S.F.Ry. Co., and 34.21 acres out of Porcion No. 41; said 487.02 acre tract being designated as Share No. 4, in that certain Deed of Partition executed by Candelario Hector Ramirez, and others, under date of June 22, 1967, recorded in Vol 351, pages 113-125, Deed Records of Webb County, Texas, reference being made to said Deed of Partition for a metes and bounds description of said 487.02 acre tract, said oil and gas lease being recorded in Vol 445, pages 115-120 of the Deed Records of Webb County, Texas, said westerly 186.98 acres being bounded on the west by the western boundary of the 487.02 acre tract herein described and also being the eastern boundary of the 517.02 acre tract referred to in the oil and gas lease by and between MARIA GRACIELA RAMIREZ and James A. Mayo above; on the north by the northern boundary of said 487.02 acre tract being also the northern line of Survey 2089 and Survey 2085; on the South by the southern boundary line of said 487.02 acre tract being also the southern line of Survey 2091 and

Survey 2087 and on the east by a line drawn between the northern and southern lines immediately heretofore mentioned parallel to the western boundary line hereof and at such distance from said western boundary line as to enclose 186.98 acres; and from interfering in any way with Plaintiffs' rights to contract with third parties for the gathering and transportation of gas from said leased acreage referred to above.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED, ADJUDGED AND DECREED that the Defendant, MARIA GRACIELA RAMIREZ, is further restrained and enjoined from verbally and physically threatening, intimidating or otherwise interfering with Plaintiffs' employees and agents at the above described well or mineral operation.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED, ADJUDGED AND DECREED that the Plaintiffs herein tender into the registry of the Court all monies currently held in suspense by Plaintiffs in Defendant's account or that may accrue in the future in the account of Defendant, MARIA GRACIELA RAMIREZ.

All costs expended in this suit shall be taxed against the Defendant, MARIA GRACIELA RAMIREZ for which let execution issue.

Signed this 14th day of December 1981.

s/ Antonio A. Zardenetta
ANTONIO A. ZARDENETTA,
Presiding Judge, 111th Judicial
District Court, in and for Webb
County, Texas.

A True copy of the original. I certify, the 14th day of December, 1981.
MANUEL GUTIERREZ
Clerk of the District Court and County Court at Law, Webb County, Texas
By: s/ illegible, Deputy

APPENDIX III — SECTION B-2

[Notation by Petitioner; 49th District Court for Webb County, Texas in Case No. 8548, Presiding Judge Ruben Garcia with Tom Goodwin as Master in Chancery, moved from September 1985 to ____, — *there never was any formal written final judgment*, only intimidations, threats, extortion, and all the way denial of due process of law and of equal protection of the law.]

49TH JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT
WEBB COUNTY, TEXAS

CAUSE NO. 8548

STATE OF TEXAS AND WEBB COUNTY, TEXAS,

PLAINTIFFS

VS.

MARIA G. RAMIREZ

Dear Taxpayer,

The above numbered and styled cause is set for HEARING before the undersigned Master in Chancery in the 49th District Courthouse in Laredo, Webb County, Texas on date and time shown below.

At such hearing, the Master in Chanctry will hear evidence and determine whether or not to recommend to the Honorable Ruben Garcia of the 49th District Court, to enter a personal judgment against you for delinquent taxes, penalties, interest and attorney's fees and for foreclosure of liens against said property.

If you or your attorney are not present, a default judgment could be rendered against you.

s/ Tom Goodwin
TOM GOODWIN
Master in Chancery

Date and Time of Hearing

Date: September 19, 1985
Time: 2:00 p.m.
Place: 49th District Court

APPENDIX III — SECTION B-3

[Notation by Petitioner; 341st District Court for Webb County, Texas, in Case No. 20,730, Presiding Judge Elma Salinas Ender, transfering case to 49th District Court for Webb County, Texas with Presiding Judge Manuel Flores, moved from February 1987 to December 1987 — *there never was any formal written final judgment* — the most vicious denial of rights because of sex identity in the history of the nation — all the way denial of rights of due process of law and of equal protection of the law, inhuman procedures of intimidations, stigmas, terror, torture, bribery, extortion, embezzlement, attempts to kidnap for assassination — a jury totally selected by the Texas prosecution in the worst overthrow of the government by the courts of the nation, guilty verdicts by the controlled jury when in full knowledge that Defendant (Petitioner) had been tortured into signing false confessions — conspiracies by power corporations, judges, officials, officers and drug dealer to defraud Defendant (Petitioner) of her property — court transcripts distorted (tampered-with) or destroyed to conceal violations, and stigmatized Defendant (Petitioner) as an incompetent — visiting Judge Truman Roberts instructed the prosecution not to proceed, but the Texas prosecution rammed aside the judge instructions and proceeded with the malicious prosecution.]

CAUSE NO. 20,730

IN THE DISTRICT COURT
341ST JUDICIAL DISTRICT
WEBB COUNTY, TEXAS

THE STATE OF TEXAS

VS.

MARIA GRACIELA RAMIREZ

ORDER OF TRANSFER

On this the 16th day of April, 1987, the Judge of this Court, after due consideration, has determined that given that she was a member of a firm which was complained about in a civil petition filed by the defendant in this cause, it would be in the best interest of justice and judicial effeiciency that this cause not be heard and determined in this Court.

THEREFORE, IT IS ORDERED that this cause be transferred to the 49th District Court of this County of which Court that Honorable Manuel Flores is judge, the said Manuel Flores not being disqualified to try same and the parties and witnesses in this cause will appear before said Judge upon the orders of said Court.

SIGNED and ENTERED on this the 16th day of April, 1987.

s/ Elma Teresa Salinas Ender
ELMA TERESA SALINAS
ENDER, Judge
341st Judicial District Court
Webb County, Texas

ORDER OF ACCEPTANCE

This Court, being in receipt of the Order of Transfer from the 341st District Court in Cause No. 20,730, *The State of Texas vs. Maria Graciela Ramirez*, finds that jurisdiction over this cause is proper in this Court, that this Court is not otherwise disqualified to hear this cause, and that said transfer is justified.

WHEREFORE, this Court does acknowledge receipt and accepts transfer of this cause and hereby orders that this said cause be docketed in this Court to be carried the same as if it were

originally pending in this Court.

SIGNED and ENTERED on this the 24th day of April, 1987.

s/ Manuel R. Flores
MANUEL FLORES, Judge
49th Judicial District Court
Webb County, Texas

FILED: April 24, 1987
ENTERED: VOL. 11, pp. 338

APPENDIX III — SECTION B-4

[Notation by Petitioner; 49th District Court for Webb County, Texas in Case No. 38,011, Presiding Judge Manuel Flores, moved from February 1987 to April 1990 — a double-jeopardy case arising from case No 20,730, and *filed at the court before case No. 20,730* as a civil action filed before a criminal action in conspiracies with judges, attorneys, officials, power corporations, drug dealer — all the way denial of due process of law and of equal protection of the law, intimidations, threats, blackmail, conspiracy in extortion and embezzlements by judges, officials, and power corporations, perjury testimonies all the way, denial of change of venue and of jury trial — visiting Judge Richard Woods permitted the one-sided perjury testimonies as a final judgment — denial of change of venue over and over again — Judge Manuel Flores continually insisting that an Hispanic woman before the court has to have a lawyer.)

Cause No. 38,011

IN THE DISTRICT COURT

49TH JUDICIAL DISTRICT

WEBB COUNTY, TEXAS

GENARO DELEZA,

Plaintiff,

vs.

MARIA GRACIELA RAMIREZ,

Defendant.

JUDGMENT

In absence of application for trial by jury and payment of jury fee, the above entitled cause came on for hearing before this court on June 30, 1988, Plaintiff, Genaro Deleza appearing in person and by his attorney and Defendant, Maria Graciela Ramirez appearing in person.

After presentation of the testimony and exhibits and evidence, and argument of counsel, the court found that the allegation asserted in Plaintiffs First Amended Petition were in all respect proven by a proponderance of the evidence.

Based on such findings the court is of the opinion that judgment should be rendered in favor of Plaintiff.

IT IS THEREFORE ADJUDGED:

1. That Plaintiff recover from Defendant actual damages in the sum of $52,000.00, with pre-judgment interest thereon at the rate of ten percent (10%) per annum from May 8, 1987, until the date this judgment is signed in the amount of $6,013.50.

2. That Plaintiff recover exemplary damages in the amount of $30,000.00.

3. That Plaintiff recover interest on the above amounts which total $88,013.50 at the rate of ten percent (10%) per annum from the date this judgment is signed until paid.

4. That Plaintiff recover from the Defendant Maria Graciela Ramirez all costs of court.

SIGNED AND ENTERED on this 11th day of July, 1988.

s/ Richard J. Woods
RICHARD J. WOODS, JUDGE
49th District Court
Webb County, Texas

A True copy of the original. I certify, the 19th day of July, 1988
MANUEL GUTIERREZ
Clerk of the District Courts and County Court at Law, Webb County, Texas
By: s/ illegible, Deputy

APPENDIX III — SECTION C-1

(Notation by Petitioner; The jury in Case No. 20,730 in The State of Texas -v- Maria Graciela Ramirez of January 7 and 8 of 1987, was totally selected by the Texas Prosecution, and controlled by the Prosecution — and the government of due process of law, of equal protection of the law, and of an impartial jury was dissolved and a terrorist form of government established by Texas.)

No. 20730 Jury Chosen Deccember 7, 1987

State of Texas

vs.

Maria Graciela Ramirez

JURY CHOSEN

1. Antonio G. Rodriguez
2. Christine Sue Leal
3. Valentin Lopez Jr.
4. David Castillo
5. Carmen M. Villaneal
6. Gabriel Martinez Jr.
7. Alfredo Rodriguez
8. Basilio Light
9. Maria Guadalupe Cervante
10. Maria Magdalena Rodriguez
11. Francesco Javier Diaz
12. Hector Mario Nieto

APPENDIX III — SECTION C-2

(Notation by Petitioner; The very crucial court transcripts of December 7 and 8 of 1987 in Case No. 20,730 at the 49th District Court for Webb County, Texas — have been denied to Defendant (Petitioner) over and over again and soon will be destroyed — thus maliciously destroying critical and decisive testimonies and court procedures in violations of Democratic doctrines.)

Ana Laura Alcantar, Court Reporter
P.O. Box 6297
Laredo, Texas 78042-6297

AFFIDAVIT

THIRD WRITTEN PETITION FOR COURT TRANSCRIPTS

I, Maria Graciela Ramirez petitions to Court Reporter, Ana Laura Alcantar, for the Court transcripts of December 7, 1987, and of December 8, 1987 identified as Cause No. 20,730 in The State of Texas -vs- Maria Graciela Ramirez in criminal action, within the 49th District Court for Webb County, Texas.

It is that this is the third written petition for such court transcripts, and many verbal petitions along the years from the first day of petition for such court transcripts on December 8, 1987.

It is that the two previous written petitions for the court transcripts have included each a check for $100, but such petitions have been ignored and the checks never appeared as cancelled.

It is that Maria Graciela Ramirez has promised to pay for such court transcripts, and such has been denied over and over since December 1987 by Court Reporter Alcantar.

To deny such court transcripts to petitioner (defendant) is Obstruction of Justice — and to destroy such court transcripts is malicious destruction of evidence, of such crucial court transcripts.

Maria Graciela Ramirez again petitions Court Reporter Ana Laura Alcantar, to sell to Maria Graciela Ramirez the two court transcripts requested since December 1987.

In Affirmation,

s/ Maria Graciela Ramirez
MARIA GRACIELA RAMIREZ
1517 Garcia St.
Laredo, Texas 78040
(512/723-6925)

s/ Marta Alicia Garcia
MARTA ALICIA GARCIA
Notary Public, Webb County, Texas
Commission Expires May 25, 1993

Date: June 30, 1992

Supreme Court, U.S.
FILED
SEP 21 1992
OFFICE OF THE CLERK

No. 92-113

In The

Supreme Court of the United States

October Term, 1992

MARIA GRACIELA RAMIREZ,

Petitioner,

vs.

THE STATE OF TEXAS,

Respondent.

On Petition for Writ of Certiorari to the Supreme Court of Texas

PETITIONER'S SUPPLEMENTAL BRIEF

MARIA GRACIELA RAMIREZ
Petitioner, Pro Se
1517 Garcia Street
Laredo, Texas 78040
(512) 723-6925

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

Table of Authorities i

Lodging for Brief 2

Statement of the Brief 2

Summary 5

Conclusion 6

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Statutes Cited:

18 U.S.C. § 1512(1)(B) 5

18 U.S.C. § 1621 5

18 U.S.C. § 1622 5

18 U.S.C. § 1961 5

28 U.S.C. § 1654 ..... 4, 5

United States Supreme Court, June 1980, Civil Right Law 1871 5

United States Constitution Cited:

U.S. Const. amend. XIV(1) 2, 5

U.S. Const. Article VI(2) 5

No. 92-113

In the

Supreme Court of the United States

October Term, 1992

MARIA GRACIELA RAMIREZ,

Petititioner,

vs.

THE STATE OF TEXAS,

Respondent.

On Petition for Writ of Certiorari to the Supreme Court of Texas

PETITIONER'S SUPPLEMENTAL BRIEF

Petitioner, Maria Graciela Ramirez, *Pro Se*, approaches the Court with a Supplemental Brief to further disclose overwhelming evidence of the severe abuse of rights imposed upon Petitioner by Texas judges and officials, who moved in conspiracies with federal judges so as to extend such segregationist procedures defrauding women of their rights.

Petitioner further moves to inform the Court of the highly criminal activities used by the courts of Texas in conspiracies with federal courts, to defraud Petitioner of large amounts of money by using perjury testimonies, and criminal transactions within the courts.

It is that a conspiracy of Texas and federal judges have declared, by their actions, that an Hispanic woman as *pro se* before the Texas and before the federal courts of the Southern District of Texas, shall be publicly struck down as being "mentally incompetent" and "emotionally disturbed", and thus defrauded of all her rights and property — in severe violation of the 14th Amendment, section one of the United States Constitution.

It is that with the conspiracy of Texas and federal judges, and Assistant United States Attorney Manuel Porro-Vizcarra — Petitioner remains totally without rights, and threatened never to approach the courts with a complaint, thus in the United States of America a foreigner before the courts is protected by rights, but a woman citizen is denied the rights guaranteed by her nation equally to all.

LODGING FOR BRIEF

Documented material, related to Brief, has been Lodged with the Clerk of the Court.

STATEMENT OF THE BRIEF

The Supplemental Brief, with factual documents, moves to further disclose the severe abuse of rights upon a woman imposed by conspiracies of state and federal judges, using procedures to gag, intimidate, and defraud a woman of her rights and property, by using criminal activities of organized crime, and public defamation stigmas.

I. Texas and federal judges conspired to publicly stigmatize Petitioner as of "mental illness", so as to defraud Petitioner of all her rights, and her property — and the stigma of mental illness has been viciously and maliciously used in the courts of the nation, so as to rob a woman of her property. (*See* Lodging.)

A. Texas Judge Manuel Flores, 49th District Court for Webb County, Texas — presiding in Cause No. 20,730, in the worse sham prosecution the nation has ever seen — on August 17, 1987, without cause of reason, publicly moved to stigmatize Petitioner as "mentally incompetent", so as to silence Petitioner's voice to a fair hearing, and thus, to serve as an example to all Hispanic women who should approach the courts as *pro se*.

B. Federal Judge James DeAnda of U.S. District Court for the Southern District of Texas — in Case No. H-88-0277 of February 24, 1988, moved in conspiracy with Texas Judge Manuel Flores, to silence the voice of Petitioner with the most destructive public defamation stigma of "emotionally disturbed" upon Petitioner — being the most brutal attack to silence the rights of a woman ever to surface in the history of the courts of the nation, directly exposing the anti-women segregationist courts that have always existed and will continue to exist if the *Maria* case is not exposed.

II. Texas and federal judges moved to conspire in criminal activities with TransAmerican Natural Gas Corporation, to defraud Petitioner of her land and mineral monies, by using the courts to defraud Petitioner of all her protective and security rights — and thus, using the courts as racketeering centers by criminal corporations and state and federal judges in organized procedures of intimidations, extortion and embezzlements. (*See* Lodging.)

A. Texas Judge Antonio Zardenetta, 111th District Court for Webb County, Texas — presided in Cause No. 31,320, and on December 14, 1981, ordered that Good Hope Refineries, Inc. (now TransAmerican Natural Gas Corporation) "tender into the registry of the Court all monies currently held in suspense by Plaintiffs (Good Hope) in Defendant's account" (Petitioner's account). — the money in the "registry of the Court" has never surfaced, was embezzled by the court.

B. Texas Judge Manuel Flores, 49th District Court for Webb

County, Texas — moved to bribe Petitioner to give up part of her land, and when Petitioner refused the bribe, Judge Flores in conspiracy with the District Attorney, moved to preside in the sham prosecution on Case No. 20,730 and the double jeopardy Case No. 38,011, both moving with perjury testimonies, perjury subornation, and continual obstruction of justice — where Petitioner was gagged of her defense, denied a fair hearing, denied a change of venue — and the conspiracy of Judge Flores and TransAmerican Natural Gas Corporation moved to embezzle more than $89,000 dollars from the mineral suspense monies of Petitioner, in organized crime procedures.

C. Federal Bankruptcy Judge Manuel Leal, and Chief Judge James DeAnda of the United States District Courts for the Southern District of Texas – moved in conspiracy with Trans-American Natural Gas Corporation to embezzle twelve million dollars ($12,000,000) from the awarded bankruptcy claim monies of Petitioner — the largest embezzlement criminal activity involving judges of the United States of America — whereby Bankruptcy Judge Manuel Leal totally defrauded Petitioner of every right to a fair hearing and the final judgment in a one-sided hearing was concealed from Petitioner (Claimant) for many months.

D. The law profession has total control of the courts of the nation, eliminating the laws and rights of equality when denying women their rights to approach the courts as *pro se*, in violations of 28 U.S.C. § 1654 — appearance personally or by counsel, while imposing monetary sanctions or cruel punishments upon a woman who approaches the courts as *pro se*.

E. It is that the State Bar of Texas, with date of September 3, 1992, has moved to intimidate Petitioner into remaining silent, when Petitioner submitted complaints upon Texas attorneys— and the investigative committee of the State Bar of Texas intimidated Petitioner of "Unauthorized Practice of Law" for approaching the courts as *pro se*.

It is that federal law as 28 U.S.C. § 1654 extends to everyone, including women, the right to "plead and conduct their own cases personally", and the 14th Amendment right, section one of the United States Constitution guarantees such liberty freedom rights — and no State or State Bar of Texas has the power to overthrow the laws of the land (U.S. Const. Article VI(2)), or violate the constitutional rights of the people.

SUMMARY

It is that the courts of the nation can no longer identify with dignity and justice, when its state and federal judges conspire to segregate the women citizens of even the basic liberty rights — and move to use their courts as private dealers for criminal activities — in violations of 18 U.S.C. § 1621–Perjury;18 U.S.C. § 1622–Subornation of Perjury; 18 U.S.C. § 1512(1)(B)–Obstruction of Justice; 18 U.S.C. § 1961–Racketeering.

It is that the Supreme Court of the United States, in June 1980, ruled that under the Civil Rights Laws of 1871, a citizen in violation of her rights by the state, could move to sue the state, thus Petitioner approached the Texas Supreme Court with a complaint on a violations of her rights by judges and officials, but was ignored because of sex identity approaching as *pro se*.

CONCLUSION

Petitioner prays to the Court to review the factual evidence, that discloses the severe violations of rights upon women very much existing within the courts of the nation — and pleads to the Court to bring forth the *Maria* case by the Supreme Court of the United States to formally declare the liberties and freedom rights equal for women.

Respectfully submitted,

MARIA GRACIELA RAMIREZ
Petitioner, Pro Se